

REMARKS

Claims 11, 14, 15, 18, 30, 45, 46, 48, 49 and 54-61 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, allowable claim 11 is rewritten into independent form incorporating the features of independent claim 1 and intervening claim 9, allowable claim 18 is rewritten into independent form incorporating the features of independent claim 1 and intervening claim 16 and allowable claim 30 is rewritten into independent form incorporating the features of independent claim 1 and intervening claim 29. Claims 15 and 49 is amended for clarity, and claims 1-10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19-29, 34-44, 47 and 50-53 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional applications to pursue the subject matter of non-elected, canceled claims 34-44 and 50-53. Support for the amendments to claim 15 can be found in original claims 1 and 13 and on page 55, lines 2-11 of the international publication of the specification. Added claims 54-61 correspond to and more broadly recite the subject matter of amended claims 11, 15, 14, 18, 30, 46, 48 and 49, respectively. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants request that the Examiner consider the references submitted with the January 12, 2009 Information Disclosure Statement and return to Applicants' undersigned representatives a fully initialed Form PTO-1449.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 45 is allowed and that claims 11, 18 and 30 recite allowable subject matter. As mentioned above, claims 11, 18 and 30 are rewritten into independent form to incorporate the features of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, independent claims 11, 18 and 30 are allowable. Added claims 54, 57 and 58 substantially correspond to allowable claims 11, 18 and 30, respectively, and

therefore also are allowable. Further, Applicants assert that the remaining claims are patentable over the applied references for the reasons discussed below.

The Office Action rejects claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §101. The rejection is obviated by the above amendments to claim 49. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Saito, U.S. Patent No. 5,153,729. The rejection of canceled claims 1-4, 6 and 19 is moot.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 9, 10, 20-29, 31-33 and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Satoh, U.S. Patent No. 2007/0109426 A1. The rejection of canceled claims 1-3, 9, 10, 20-29, 31-33 and 47 is moot. The rejection of claims 46, 48 and 49 is respectfully traversed.

Satoh does not disclose an image storage apparatus having a medium detector that detects if the storage medium connected to the connecting device is a storage medium limiting a number of overwrite, as recited in independent claim 46.

Satoh discloses in step S341 of Fig. 78 that a determination is made whether write protection of a memory card has been released (see paragraph [0346]). However, a memory with a writing prohibition setting is not equivalent to a memory that limits a number of overwrites. If the writing prohibition on the memory in Satoh is released, re-writing is again possible on the memory card without any restriction of the number of overwrites. Therefore, Satoh does not disclose an image storage apparatus having a medium detector that detects if the storage medium connected to the connecting device is a storage medium limiting a number of overwrite, as recited in independent claim 46.

Further, Satoh does not disclose an image storage apparatus having an image storage memory and a delete control device that controls so as to receive image data recorded in a storage medium connected to the connecting device, store the received image data in the

image storage memory and delete the image data of the storage medium automatically after storage thereof, as recited in independent claim 46.

Satoh discloses that shot video data is fed through a card interface 10 to be stored in a memory card 11 (see paragraph [0165]). Satoh discloses that the video data can be read out from the memory card 11 via the card interface 10 and then is recorded into a frame memory 5 (see paragraph [0166]). However, Satoh does not disclose any feature that automatically deletes the video data after the video data has been recorded into frame memory 5. Therefore, Satoh does not disclose an image storage apparatus having an image storage memory and a delete control device that controls so as to receive image data recorded in a storage medium connected to the connecting device, store the received image data in the image storage memory and delete the image data of the storage medium automatically after storage thereof, as recited in independent claim 46.

Therefore, independent claim 46 and dependent claim 48 are patentable over Satoh for at least these reasons.

With respect to independent claim 49, and for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 46, Satoh does not disclose a computer readable medium that is encoded with instructions for performing a step of detecting whether a storage medium connected to a connecting device is a storage medium limiting a number of overwrite, a step of receiving image data recorded in the storage medium connected to the connecting device and storing the received image data in the image storage memory, a step of deleting the image data of the storage medium automatically after storage of the image data, and a step of halting automatic deletion of the image data after storage thereof when it is detected that the storage medium limiting a number of overwrite is connected to the connecting device, as recited in independent claim 49. Therefore, independent claim 49 is patentable over Satoh.

Thus it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of Fukushima, U.S. Patent No. 5,642,458. The rejection of canceled claim 5 is moot.

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 8, 13-15 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of Iijima, U.S. Patent No. 4,887,234. The rejection of canceled claims 7, 8, 13 and 28 is moot. The rejection of claims 14 and 15 is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Saito and Iijima does not disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, a digital camera having a storage medium that limits a number of overwrite, as recited in independent claim 15.

Saito discloses that a memory cartridge 12 has a header 50 having a write inhibit flag for permitting or inhibiting a write operation in a storage area 34 of memory cartridge 12 (see col. 4, lines 22-29). However, the write inhibit flag of Saito inhibits writing due to a setting, and does not show that there is a limitation to the number of writings in the storage area 34 of memory cartridge 12.

Iijima fails to overcome the deficiencies of Saito. Specifically, the EEPROM disclosed in Iijima is a non-volatile memory, which allows re-writing without a limitation to the number of re-writings (see col. 1, lines 14-28). Further, Iijima discloses that once recording is performed, personal identification number data, which is controlled so as not to be changed, can be re-writable by going through a predetermined processing. As such, Iijima does not disclose that there is a limitation on the number of writings in a storage area. Therefore, the combination of Saito and Iijima does not disclose, and would not have rendered obvious, a digital camera having a storage medium that limits a number of overwrite, as recited in independent claim 15. Therefore, independent claim 15 and dependent claim 14 are patentable over the combination of Saito and Iijima. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of Yamamoto et al. (Yamamoto), U.S. Patent No. 6,683,650. The rejection of canceled claims 9, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 27 is moot.

Applicants assert that added claims 54-61 respectively are patentable over the applied references for the same reasons discussed above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

Justin T. Lingard
Registration No. 61,276

MAC:JTL/emd

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Amendment Transmittal

Date: May 26, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

| |
|---|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|---|